

REMARKS

Claims 19-47 are pending in this application. The subject matter of the new claims is fully supported in the specification and claims as originally filed. For reasons set forth below, Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims allowed to issue.

1. The Claims Are Not Anticipated

Claims 19, 21, 25, 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gilbert et. al (1993, Transplantation 56: 974-7; “Gilbert”). Claims 20, 26, 28, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Knight et al. or Waldrep et al. These rejections are in error and should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth below.

Anticipation requires that all the elements and limitations of the claims be found within a single prior art references. There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosures, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1896 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In the present instance, the claims as amended encompass aerosolized compositions “consisting essentially of” : (i) cyclosporine and a propellant; (ii) cyclosporine, a dry powder and a propellant; or (iii) cyclosporine, an organic solvent and a propellant, and the

## PATENT

use of such compositions for prevention of graft rejection, pulmonary inflammation and/or inhibition of the immune response associated with T-cell mediated immune disorders using such compositions. In contrast Gilbert, Waldrep, and Knight discloses the generation of small particle aerosol liposomes containing cyclosporine and the use of such liposomes as an immunosuppressive agent to treat lung disease.

Applicants assert that it well accepted that the use of the claim phrase “consisting essentially of” excludes ingredients that would materially effect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed compositions. *Atlas Powder Co. v E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F2d 1569, 224 U.S.P.Q. 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2111.03 (6<sup>th</sup> ed. 1997). In a recent Federal Circuit case it was stated that “Consisting essentially of” is a transitional phrase commonly used to signal a partially open claim in a composition claim or a series of steps in a process claim. By using the term “consisting essentially of,” the drafter signals that the invention necessarily includes the listed ingredients and is open to unlisted ingredients that do not materially affect the basic and novel properties of the invention.” *PPG Industries Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp.*, 48 USPQ2d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1354).

In the present instance, the relevant question is whether the encapsulation of cyclosporine into liposomes would materially alter the characteristics of Applicant’s claimed compositions and methods. Clearly the answer to this question is yes. Liposome encapsulated cyclosporine would have altered pharmacokinetic properties as compared to non-encapsulated formulations of cyclosporine. For example, because liposomes resemble cell membranes in their

## PATENT

structure and composition, the delivery of a liposome encapsulated drug into a cell would be expected to occur as a fusion event between the cell membrane and the liposome membrane resulting in the transfer of the drug into the cell. Clearly, compositions such as Applicants, in which the cyclosporine is non-encapsulated, could not enter the cell via a membrane fusion event.

Therefore, given the differences between the cited references and the present invention, the references cannot anticipate the present invention and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

2. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103  
SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 20-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Adjei and Waldrep et al. (U.S. Patent 5,956,378; "Waldrep"), in view of Gilbert, Knight et al. (U.S. Patent 5,049,388) and Applicant's admission on the record. According to the Examiner Adjei, Waldrep, Gilbert, Knight and Applicant admit on the record that the claimed compounds are old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. According to the Examiner, these medicaments are thought as useful for treating graft rejection, inflammation and those conditions claimed and disclosed by Applicant.

A finding of obviousness under §103 requires a determination of the scope and content of the prior art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the difference between the claimed

## PATENT

subject matter and the prior art, and whether the differences are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *Graham v. Deere*, 383 U.S.1, (1996). The relevant inquiry is whether the prior art suggests the invention and whether the prior art provides one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success. *In re: O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1673 (Fed. Circ. 1988). In addition, "one way for a patent applicant to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness is to make a showing of unexpected results", *In re Soni*, 54 F. 3d 746, 34 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1684 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

In the present instance, the relevant inquiry is whether any of the cited references suggest compositions of aerosolized cyclosporine, that are not encapsulated in liposomes, and their use for prevention of graft rejection, pulmonary inflammation and/or inhibition of the immune response associated with T-cell mediated immune disorders.

A review of the Waldrep, Gilbert and Knight references reveals that each of the references only disclose compositions comprising liposomal encapsulated cyclosporine. Applicants assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that liposomal formulations containing cyclosporine would have altered pharmacokinetic properties, such as biodistribution, clearance rates, and toxicity as compared to non-encapsulated formulations of cyclosporine. Applicants assert that the mere disclosure of liposomal formulations of cyclosporine would fail to suggest the claimed methods and compositions of the invention, *i.e.*, non-encapsulated formulations of cyclosporine, nor provide any expectation that the claimed methods utilizing

PATENT

such compositions could successfully be practiced.

In addition, although Adjei discloses compositions of non-encapsulated cyclosporine, Adjei fails to disclose or suggest that such non-encapsulated compositions could be successfully used to prevent graft rejection, pulmonary inflammation and/or inhibition of the immune response associated with T-cell mediated immune disorders using such compositions. Further, this deficiency in the teaching of Adjei is not remedied by any of the additionally cited references.

In summary, Adjei and Waldrep, in combination with Gilbert and Knight, fail to suggest the compositions of the claimed invention or provide a reasonable expectation of success in the use of such compositions for prevention of graft rejection, pulmonary inflammation and/or inhibition of the immune response associated with T-cell mediated immune disorders. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the foregoing amendments and remarks into the file of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that the invention described

PATENT

and defined by the claims is patentable. Withdrawal of all rejections and consideration of the new claims is requested. An early allowance is earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,

*Carmella L. Stephens*

Rochelle K. Seide

PTO Reg. No. 19,498

Attorney for Applicants

Carmella L. Stephens

PTO Reg. No. 41,328

Agent for Applicants

(212) 408-2500

Enclosures